A U M

Ideas are the parents of men and things; there was never anything that did not proceed from a thought. —EMERSON

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIII October, 1955 No. 12

HUMAN DESTINY

WHILE the archaic philosophy known to present generations as Theosophy does not change from age to age—not, that is, in essentials—the temper and attitudes of one period of human history may vary greatly from those of others. Our own time, for example, is strikingly different from, say, the time of Gotama Buddha, and different, again, from all those epochs in which the image of a cultural hero such as Siegfried and Galahad gave nourishment to the aspirations of men.

The point of drawing such a comparison is to consider the measure of alienation suffered by the great masses of people at the present time from ideas or teachings about man which lend support to a philosophy of soul.

The content of hero legends and myths introduces a theme for human thought which is completely lacking in modern culture. While it may be true that the "average" man of ancient times did not undertake to be a hero, there was nevertheless this ideal which represented to him the highest human achievement. If he was content with his "average" life, he was at least prevented by such tales of extraordinary bravery and heroism from feeling an unwonted pride or complacency. He knew he followed the lesser course; that he skirted the challenge of the unknown, and walked in paths marked out by other men. A great life, he was bound to admit, is a life of chivalry and daring.

There is perhaps a moral in the fact that in our own day, when these high objectives are seldom thought of, even in an appropriately contemporary idiom, the complaint of those who suffer failure and frustration is heard on every hand. Failure, it seems, imposes its heaviest weight of sorrow upon those who try only to keep up with their neigh-

bors. A man might be able to stand failure with unbowed head, if he had failed in a worthy enterprise; but where is the dignity in not being able to maintain the pace set by mediocrity? The soul, one must suspect, feels doubly betrayed—first in the deception of ignoble ends, and second in the shame of not reaching even these. So the pain of self-deprecation haunts the type of modern man, who suffers the constant presence of that shallow misery which he is unable to explain, since he has not the least understanding of the place of pain and suffering in human life. Here, surely, is the saddest outcome of the altruism of nineteenth-century utilitarian philosophy, which sets its sights upon a goal of economic well-being, while failing to understand the psychology of human unhappiness. The "plenty" which those eminent reformers sought to achieve for all is already at the disposal of many millions, yet contentment is as far away as ever.

For the hero, pain is virtually irrelevant. Even the folly of a Don Quixote has a majesty borrowed from his knightly dreams, so that his stature grows even as his simplicities are exposed to laughter. The goal of high, unselfish achievement creates a scale of values in human experience which renders discomfort and privation insignificant; indeed, the course of training of a youth destined to knightly enterprise was deliberately planned to inure him to every sort of ill-fortune and adverse condition. He was taught to fear only weakness in himself, to shun compromise, and to accept every disciplining imposed by circumstances as a trial of his strength.

From the ardors of the heroic life to the eightfold path of Gotama Buddha may seem a far cry, yet there is a sense in which they are alike. One vanquished pain by overshadowing it, the other disposed of it by subtle analysis of the illusions which give pain birth. Further, they also have in common the idea of transcendental objective—an end to be reached beyond the petty objectives of the personal self. While in either case, the decision to be hero or arhat may have been made by very few, the ideal gave order and proportion to the thoughts of men about themselves. The high counsels were not unknown, even though they chose not to regard them. There was always a classical solution available to the restlessness of the man who found no contentment in an ordinary life.

The hero's solution, it is true, is for the strong and the brave. This is in a sense the answer of the stoic—the man who puts suffering away as beneath his dignity, as not even needing explanation. Today, a man

with heroic impulses has also the expanded and highly developed rational nature—increment of long cycles of evolution—to deal with in himself. He has also to explain, as well as to bear, his suffering. So there is a sense in which the hero needs to learn the Buddha's secret, and the disciple of Gotama, to feel the thrill that urges on the hero in his quest.

These are considerations which may weigh heavily upon the humble student of the Wisdom Religion, for who counts himself a hero, and who feels worthy to be named a disciple? Then, besides these obstacles or conditions, stands the formidable pattern of a culture which has lost by the way what dreams of heroism it once possessed, and couches its most knowing expressions in the vocabulary of the market place. What is tragically lacking is a sense of orientation for individual man—orientation in the social world, and orientation in the private world of one's own feelings, fears, and intimations of failure.

What shall be blamed for how we feel? This question most naturally overtakes all those who think of themselves as part of the modern world, and an expression of its development. Least of all, perhaps, are those endeavoring to be philosophers free of the oppression of this query, since to the bewilderments of the world, which they have from their time, are added those which come from secret strivings and hungers of the heart.

A man can learn dispassion with respect to the ills of the body—the ills, as we say, "to which the flesh is heir." But how can he make peace with the aches that beset his mind and feelings? Should he, even, *want* to be free of those pangs which disturb his hours of reflection and self-examination? Where does puritan fanaticism end and honest self-appraisal begin?

An intellectual response to these inquiries is not too difficult to find. For example, on the question of "success" in Theosophy—and this, after all, is what we are discussing—Madame Blavatsky wrote in her article, "Our Three Objects":

> Though but a minority of our members are mystically inclined, yet in point of fact, the key to all our successes . . . is in our recognition of the fact of the Higher Self—colourless, cosmopolitan, unsectarian, sexless, unworldly, altruistic—and the doing of our work on that basis.

This "key" is surely the key to the aspirant's dispassionate viewing of his own imperfections, which, from the point of view of the Higher

Self, are no more than the raw materials with which he has to work. If they did not exist, he would have less to do, nor, for that matter, would he have so many points of personal contact with his similarly encumbered fellow men. For human imperfections are a substantial aspect of the Karma which brings men together in association, for their common instruction.

It is philosophy, the philosophy of the Higher Self, which enables a man to stand off from the agonizing of his psychic nature, even as another may stand off from the sufferings of the body.

Then there is this verse in *The Voice of the Silence*:

> If thou art taught that sin is born of action and bliss of absolute inaction, then tell them that they err. Non-permanence of human action; deliverance of mind from thralldom by the cessation of sin and faults, are not for "Deva [reincarnating] Egos." Thus saith the "Doctrine of the Heart."

The meaning here seems to be that even the sense of frustration which overtakes the eager disciple is to be born with fortitude—not as a mark of sinfulness, but as one of the conditions of life.

So if a man would remove the sting from his ordeals of self-condemnation, his feelings of inadequacy, he has only to take the advice that has been offered from the very beginning of the cycle of human development. He has to stop thinking about himself, to stop "caring" about his progress. We may suspect that the peace which comes to the "Buddha of Compassion" requires this decisive step. And the greatest paradox of all may be that a man cannot have even a faint suggestion of this peace until he has ceased longing for it altogether.

THE BROADEST VIEW

What are good and evil? Good is the conscious realization of universal order, the absolute fruition of being, the fulfillment of individual function, in accordance with the conditions for the most perfect and prolonged fulfillment of the universal totality of functions. . . . Now evil is the opposite or negation of this. It is whatever lessens the fruition of life, prevents the fulfillment of function, contracts or mars the realization of universal order in the consciousness of a living being.

—WILLIAM R. ALGER

HYPNOTISM AND THEOSOPHY

By WILLIAM Q. JUDGE, F.T.S.

IS hypnotism understood? What is the attitude of the Theosophical Society to hypnotism?

It is thought by some that magnetism and hypnotism are identical; for many have said this new force or power is only the old practice of Mesmer revived in this century, after long years of contempt, and labeled with a new name, which will permit doctors to take it up. This is not, however, altogether true. Dr. Charcot, of Paris, and his followers, may be credited with the revival of hypnotism; for, in consequence of their investigations, it has been accepted by the medical profession. I have seen the prominent doctors of the Atlantic coast change their views on this subject in twenty-five years. Dr. Hammond and others laughed at the credulity of those who believed that the phenomena, now so well known among hypnotizers, ever took place; today they write articles and admit the facts previously denied.

Many years ago, Dr. Esdaile, a surgeon of the British army, conducted a hospital in India, and there performed many difficult operations by using magnetism as an anaesthetic, even instructing native assistants to use it on patients in his stead. His book, long ago published, gives all the facts. There is plenty of testimony in all countries to the reality of the mesmeric and hypnotic states and powers.

The great question which arose after the proofs about hypnotism were in, was a very different one from any which has previously been brought forward. As soon as the process was described and admitted, experiments proceeded with rapidity, and the great subject of "suggestion" was laid bare. It was found that the hypnotized person could be made to do many strange things after recovering from the hypnotic state, provided the suggestion had been made to him when he was in the state. The subject was told to murder Dr. A or B; to steal a pocketbook. He was then taken out of the hypnotic state, and, at the appointed time, would take the suggested weapon—a paper knife or harmless thing—and go through all the required actions, or would actually steal the object he was told to steal. If this power could be used by a doctor

---

NOTE.—This article, reprinted in THEOSOPHY for December, 1938, first appeared in the *Jenness Miller Illustrated Monthly,* possibly some time in 1893. It is here reproduced from an undated page torn from this journal. A search for the volume in which it appeared has proved fruitless, the set in the Library of Congress being incomplete.—Editors.

in an experiment, it was argued that an actual murder might be planned and executed through a hypnotized person. Hence it was dangerous. Crime is possible of perpetration with impunity by the real culprit. Dr. Charcot gave an article to an important New York magazine in which he admitted the probabilities of suggestion to patients, but denied that there was danger from suggested crime, and yet also said there ought to be laws against indiscriminate hypnotization. In the latter conclusion, most of the Theosophical Society's members fully concur, but they also think that there is, and will be, danger from crime suggested to hypnotic subjects. Not in the immediate present, but in the future.

This is because hypnotism is not understood nor its dangers appreciated by the medical profession; still less do they credit the public with a correct knowledge on the subject.

The very best hypnotizers know very well that there are points at which the hypnotized subject escapes their influence, continues in the hypnotic state, and remains under some influence not known to the operator nor distinguishable by the subject. Here is one danger—the danger of ignorance and of a blind guide's leading one equally blind. Such writers as Braid, Binet and others are only statisticians. They simply give facts and methods, all being equally in the dark as to causes and possibilities. Again, the operators in the forefront of hypnotic fame know, too, as Dr. Charcot has said, there is a danger that hysteria will be developed where it never existed, and a long train of other evils. This is why he demands the suppression of indiscriminate operating. But the real rock of offense is this, and well known to theosophical students, that as the force and power of hypnotism are better known, it will be seen that whatever the influence is, the process going on in hypnotism is the contracting of the cells of the body and brain from the periphery to the centre. This process is actually a phenomenon of the death state, and is the opposite of the mesmeric effect; and this point is not known to the medical profession, nor will it be as they now proceed, because *post mortem* examinations never reveal the action of a living cell. Magnetism by human influence starts from within and proceeds to the outer surface, thus exhibiting a phenomenon of life the very opposite of hypnotism. And the use of magnetism is not objectionable, yet it should be limited in practice to competent members of the medical profession. The more studious and careful members of the Theosophical Society, then, are against the use of hypnotism. In all its anaesthetic phases it can be duplicated by mesmerism without

any bad effects. Dr. Esdaile has abundantly shown this. Laws ought to be passed making it a misdemeanor to have a public or private hypnotic séance. And these laws should also be aimed at even those doctors who, under the plea of science, put subjects into absurd and undignified positions. Such practices are not necessary, and are deliberately against the desire of the waking will and judgment of the subject. They only exhibit the operator's power and add nothing to knowledge that cannot be otherwise obtained.

But even with the remarkable cases recorded by Binet and others in France, the laws governing man's inner constitution, and which especially govern in hypnotism after a certain point, are not perceived by the learned writers. Some give only facts—either facts about strange recurrence of states, and others like Dr. James of this country assume that there is a hidden self who does these queer tricks with the mortal shape. Theosophists know that the extraordinary alterations in mind or mental power, the strange "recurrence of states" and the apparently distinct division or separation of intelligence in a single human subject are all explained by the ancient eastern method of reducing the inner powers of man into seven classes, in each of which the hidden self—the *Ego*—can and does act independently, the body being only a gross instrument or field for the action of the real man.

This theory divides him into seven planes of action, in each of which the *Ego* or hidden self can have a consciousness operating in a manner peculiarly appropriate to that plane, and also partaking of the consciousness and experience of the planes above it but not below. And each of these layers or fields for consciousness is further divided into other subfields, in every one of which there may be a separate experience and action, or all may be combined. Now in the cases taken up by Dr. James, the peculiarity noted was that when the subject acted as No. 1, she had no recollection of a state called No. 2. No explanation of this was offered, only the fact being recorded. It is explained by the localization of the consciousness of the *Ego* in one or the other of the subfields of action of the first of the great class of seven.

The failure to recollect from one to the other was due to the fact that the *Ego* was forced into that particular field, and was thus unable to carry recollection with it. Hence it was entirely automatic in its action on that plane. This effect was due almost entirely to the specific contractile action of the hypnotic process, which, as said above, is essentially a contraction of the cells from outside to the centre. This

will always prevent the *Ego* from educating itself to remember from state to state and field to field the experience of each, which education is however possible in the mesmerized or magnetized state, and of course in the normal waking life.

The cases where the subject escapes from the operator's control are all explicable under the same theosophic theory; that is, those are instances in which the *Ego* retreats from the first plane or field of consciousness made up of seven divisions or sub-fields to the next one of the whole class of seven, instead of entering one of the sub-divisions of the first. And, as the medical practitioners do not know of nor admit the reality of the higher inner sub-divisions, they are not acquainted with the means for reaching the *Ego* when it has escaped from them into a field of consciousness where they are not examining the *real* field of operation of the force, but are looking at some of its phenomena merely.

These phenomena are exhibited in the body or outer shell while the psycho-physiological process, going on within, and causing the visible phenomena, are hidden from their view.

THE SECRET OF NATURE

If we consider what happens in conversation, in reveries, in remorse, in times of passion, in surprises, in the instructions of dreams, wherein often we see ourselves in masquerade—the droll disguises only magnifying and enhancing a real element and forcing it on our distant notice —we shall catch many hints that will broaden and lighten into knowledge of the secret of nature. All goes to show that the soul in man is not an organ, but animates and exercises all the organs; is not a function, like the power of memory, of calculation, of comparison, but uses these as hands and feet; is not a faculty, but a light; is not the intellect or the will, but the master of the intellect and the will. The soul is the background of our being, in which they lie—an immensity not possessed and that cannnot be possessed. From within or from behind, a light shines through us upon things and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all.

—EMERSON

CONSIDERATIONS ON MAGIC

By WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

WE hear a good deal nowadays and are likely to hear still more of occult science. In this regard we may as well accept the inevitable. All things have their day, and all things revolve in cycles; they come and go, and come again, though never twice the same. Even our very thoughts conform to this universal law. The life, the teachings and the fate of Pythagoras are involved in mystery, but the fate of the schools which he established and the followers who succeeded him are matters of history. The slaughter of the Magi stands over against the abuses and abominations which were perpetrated in their name, and doubtless by many styling themselves Magicians.

It is not the object of this brief paper to attempt to define magic, or elucidate occult Science as such, but rather to suggest a few considerations which are of vital import at the present time, equally important to those who utterly deny to magic any more than an imaginative basis, as to those who, convinced of its existence as a science, are, or are to become, investigators. In both the publications and conversations of the day, frequently occur the expressions "black magic," and "white magic," and those who follow these studies are designated as followers of the *"left hand path,"* or the *"right hand path."* It ought to be understood that up to a certain point all students of magic, or occultism, journey together. By and by is reached *a place where two roads meet,* or where the common path divides, and the *awful voice from the silence,* heard only in the recesses of the individual soul, utters the stern command: *"Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve."* Instead of black and white magic, read black and white *motive.*

The student of occultism is rushing on to his destiny, but up to a certain point that destiny is in his own hands, though he is constantly shaping his course, freeing his soul from the trammels of sense and self, or becoming entangled in the web, which with warp and woof will presently clothe him as with a garment without a seam.

NOTE.—Mr. Judge printed "Considerations on Magic," in the *Path* for March, 1887. This article is for the fourth time reprinted in THEOSOPHY, last appearing in March, 1939. —Editors.

If early in the race he finds it difficult to shake off his chains, let him remember that at every step they grow more and more tyrannical, and often before the goal is reached where the ways divide, the battle is lost or won, and the decision there is only a matter of form. That decision once made is irrevocable, or so nearly so that no exception need be made. Man lives at once in two worlds: the natural and the spiritual, and as in the natural plane he influences his associates, and is in turn influenced by them, so let him not imagine that in the spiritual plane he is alone. This will be a fatal mistake for the dabbler in magic, or the student in occultism. Throughout this vast universe, the good will seek the good, and the evil the evil; each will be unconsciously *drawn to its own kind.*

But when man faces his destiny in full consciousness of the issues involved, as he must before the final decision is reached, he will be no longer unconscious of these influences, but will recognize his companions: companions, alas! no longer; *Masters* now, inhuman, pitiless; and the same law of attraction which has led him along the tortuous path unveils its face, and by affinity of evil, the slave stands in the presence of his master, and the fiends that have all along incited him to laugh at the miseries of his fellow men, and trample under his feet every kindly impulse, every tender sympathy, now make the measureless hells within his own soul resound with their laughter at him, the poor deluded fool whose selfish pride and ambition have stifled and at last obliterated his humanity.

Blind indeed is he who cannot see why those who are in possession of arcane wisdom, hesitate in giving it out to the world, and when in the cycles of time its day has come, they put forth the only doctrine which has power to save and bless, UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD, with all that the term implies.

There may be those who have already in this new era entered the left-hand road. But now as of old, "by their works ye shall know them." To labor with them is in vain. Selfishness, pride and lust for power are the signs by which we may know them. They may not at once cast off disguise, and they will never deceive the true Theosophist. They can, nevertheless, deceive to their ruin the ignorant, the curious and the unwary, and it is for such as these that these lines are penned; and the worst of it is, that these poor deluded souls are led to believe that no such danger exists, and this belief is fortified by the so-called scientists, who are quoted as authority, and who ridicule everything but rank

materialism. Yet notwithstanding all this, these simple souls flutter like moths around the flame till they are drawn within the vortex. It is better a million times that the proud, the selfish and time-serving should eat, drink and be merry, and let occultism alone, for these propensities, unless speedily eradicated, will bear fruit and ripen into quick harvests, and the wages thereof is death, literally the *"second death."*

The purpose of Theosophy is to eradicate these evil tendencies of man, so that, whether on the ordinary planes of daily life, or in the higher occult realms, the Christ shall be lifted up, and draw all men unto him.

"Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."

The Christs of all ages have preached this one doctrine: Charity and Brotherhood of Man. To deny the law of charity is to deny the Christ. The Theosophical Society is not responsible for unveiling to the present generation the occult nature of man. Modern Spiritualism had already done this; nor is the responsibility to be charged to the Spiritualists, for these unseen forces had revealed themselves in the fulness of time, and many millions had become convinced, many against their wills, of the reality of the unseen universe. These things *are here,* and neither crimination nor recrimination is of any use. The responsibility, therefore, rests entirely with the individual, as to what he makes of his opportunities, as to his purposes and aims, and as he advances in his course, involved in the circle of necessity, he influences whether he will or no, those whose spheres of life touch at any point his own. *As ye sow, so shall ye also reap.* By and by the cycle will close and both the evil and the good will return like bread cast upon the waters. This is a law of life.

Imagine not that they are weak and vacillating souls who enter the left-hand road: Lucifer was once a prince of light, admitted to the councils of the Most High. He fell through pride, and dragged downward in his fall all who worshipped the demon pride. This is no foolish fable, but a terrible tragedy, enacted at the gates of paradise, in the face of the assembled universe, and re-enacted in the heart of man, the epitome of all. Only Infinite pity can measure the downfall of such an one, only Infinite love disarm by annihilation, and so put an end to unendurable woe, and that only when the cycle is complete, the measure of iniquity balanced by its measure of pain. Occultism and magic are

not child's-play as many may learn to their sorrow, as many visitants of dark circles have already and long ago discovered. Better give dynamite to our children as a plaything, than Magic to the unprincipled, the thoughtless, the selfish and ignorant. Let all who have joined the Theosophical Society remember this, and search their hearts before taking the first step in any magical formulary. *The motive determines all.* Occult power brings with it unknown and unmeasured responsibility.

If in the secret councils of the soul, where no eye can see, and no thought deceive that divine spark, conscience, we are ready to forget self, to forego pride, and labor for the well-being of man, then may the upright man face this destiny, follow this guide and fear no evil. Otherwise it were better that a millstone were hung about his neck, and he were cast into the depths of the sea.

THE REALITY OF MYSTICISM

Many whose temperaments are no more mystical than mine know moments when we draw courage and joy from experiences which lie outside the getting and spending of everyday life. The occasions of such experiences are many. The commonest and perhaps the least obviously related are these: reading a poem and contemplating a child—human or animal. But the experiences come to different men in many different ways. Some are most likely to be aware of them in solitude, others in crowds; some while looking at the stars, some while watching the waves roll in upon a beach. And whether you call the experience infrarational or super-rational, it involves the momentary acceptance of values not definable in terms of that common sense to which we ordinarily accord our first loyalty. And to all such experiences one thing is common. There is a sense of satisfaction which is not personal but impersonal. One no longer asks, "What's in it for me?" because one is no longer a separate selfish individual but part of the welfare and joy of the whole.

—JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

WORD PUZZLES

THE word *progress,* simple in meaning and innocuous though it may seem, brings into focus a number of important philosophic and ethical issues of particular interest to the Theosophical student. To begin with, we have the puzzle occasioned by such statements as the following from the writings of Robert Crosbie—an emphatic remark that "the assumption that Theosophy is a system of progressive religion can only proceed from ignorance of the facts and a false conception which can only lead to confusion on the part of any student." "If there is such a knowledge as the Wisdom-Religion," Mr. Crosbie continues, "it is the result of the observation and experience of the Masters of Wisdom, and as such stands for itself; it can neither be enlarged nor improved upon by its students."

One difficulty with this emphasis arises when the student seeks adequate terms for representing the obvious truth that each inquirer is constantly discovering more Theosophy for himself each day, and attempting to utilize a more satisfactory philosophical vocabulary to express it. For the *individual,* Theosophy is certainly "progressive" and, so far as the cyclic representation of the central doctrines by Adept teachers and sages is concerned, one may also expect to encounter greater subtlety and involvement of philosophy whenever those who may listen and learn evidence a higher degree of *manasic* awareness. H.P.B.'s own Theosophical writings, for instance, are certainly "progressive" in this sense; the general allusions and statements in *Isis Unveiled* are expanded a hundredfold in portions of *The Secret Doctrine* and, as readers of this series will have noted, the choice and use of terms such as "metempsychosis" and "reincarnation" underwent clearly definable transitions, governed in large part by the needs of the immediate occasion.

Robert Crosbie's emphasis upon the fact that Theosophy is *not* progressive, on the other hand, is a necessary one for those to whom the "progressive" designation would imply that all theosophical writings are tentative and speculative—and that "improvement" of the original teachings is to be expected with each generation. The concept of a *gnosis,* a genuine Wisdom-Religion, is part of the highest faith of the Theosophist, and if one can hold no belief in Eternal Verities, he can hold no firm faith in anything. Mr. Crosbie's original letter to a student

—from which the editorial quoted was subsequently taken—goes on to mention the many "self-acclaimed leaders of societies who are very prominent in the public eye, and who proclaim and issue their own ideas, interpretations, and speculations as Theosophy pure and simple; one would expect from such exponents the false and misleading idea that 'Theosophy is a progressive system of religion,' for such a statement beclouds the facts, and serves to draw attention to their own lucubrations as 'progressed' Theosophy, and to themselves as having progressed farther and as knowing more than the original Teachers." At the root of the dilemma under discussion, then, quite clearly, is the same distinction as that appearing between *individuality* and *personality,* for unless it is possible to see that there is a *permanent* perspective for the higher ego, and truths which do not vary with idiosyncrasies of time, place and circumstances, the *nature* of impermanent idiosyncrasies —in terms of their residence in the personality—cannot be adequately grasped.

In the development of Western philosophy and science, the word *progress* has a fascinating, if confusing, history. In assessing its various stages of usage, one must begin with the realization that any essential form of intellectual *progress* was discouraged by medieval theologians. If man does not grow by self-induced efforts toward realization of the good and the true, his only concern must be to escape from evil. No philosopher was encouraged to develop any new hypotheses in the process of self-revelation, for all revelation was authoritatively set forth in church doctrine. Thus, in the subsequent revolution that freed men's minds from dependence upon a static conception of man's nature, the idea of *progress* became identified with all the more hopeful views of humanly controlled destiny. Carl Becker's illuminating *Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers* generates sympathy for revolutionary forerunners such as Condorcet, for the great "new" dream was that heaven could and would be built on earth—by *men.* The plea to the masses was that they stop foolish attempts at placating a non-existent God, and cooperate with the work of eradicating social injustice. Optimism was expressed through the belief that the Process of History would inevitably work toward improvement with the passage of time.

Two hundred years later, however, the masses had come to believe more than Condorcet intended—that since History was going to build a better future by itself, all one had to do was sit back and wait—mean-

while voicing bitter complaints against those who resisted changes favorable to the majority. Finally—and this is the central theme of José Ortega's *Revolt of the Masses*—the propagandized "working man" became convinced that History, Science and Society owed him a living of his liking. In this soil the seeds of revolutionary doctrines were successfully planted. And the character of the seeds was strongly influenced by the soil, for Marx, originally an idealist, came more and more to rely upon resentment against the *status quo* to achieve a more equitable distribution of goods and privileges, and less and less upon the awakening of the idealistic promptings of other individuals. The dream of revolution, violent revolution, was the dream of *controlling* the "historical process" by force. Finally, in turn—though one cannot help but feel sympathy for much in the progressive view of history—this reaction led to its own special brand of oversimplification and confusion among nearly all socialists, whether they called themselves "evolutionary" or "revolutionary." The development is ably summarized by Arthur Ekirch in *The Idea of Progress in America* (1944). Dr. Ekirch writes:

> Through the course of its long and important history the idea of progress has been defined and interpreted in various ways. This idea that "civilization has moved, is moving, and will move in a desirable direction" has been compared with the concepts of Fate, Providence, or personal immortality. Like those ideas it is believed in not because it is held to be good or bad, nor because it is considered to be true or false. In the words of J. B. Bury, the leading historian of the concept of progress, "belief in it is an act of faith." Bury accordingly included progress among those ideas not dependent for their fulfillment upon man's will. And in this opinion he was supported by many of the European philosophers of the concept.

So here we have the other extreme. Human "progress" is not only possible—contrary to the theological view—but inevitable. On this view the fulfilment of man becomes a quantitative rather than a qualitative process, and this may imply, in turn, that one can wait for "science" to improve his condition. Evolution, rather than being self-directed, becomes a kind of escalator, the rate of ascent being determined by the improvement of the social organism. This habit of thinking, of course, leads to passivity, and in the twentieth century may be held accountable for the indifference with which so many, in all countries, have viewed the trend towards establishment of totalitarian controls. "What can one person do?" seems a particularly excusable sentiment if the whole

climate of opinion favors tightly organized, efficient "social planning."

On the other hand, "progressive" aspirants to leadership have found a ready-to-hand justification for "ends justify the means" programs. Thus "progressive" movements have often become casuistically revolutionary. By way of political terminology, a "progressive" finally became a person who believed that, just as the individual is simply a facet of the mass, so is the present but an episode on the road to a better future. But when a man begins to think chiefly in terms of "historical process," and neglects the philosophical consideration of ethical value, he can easily subvert the rights of individual conscience and the whole cause of civil liberties on the ground that "Society" will be improved by a judicious application of compulsion in working social transformation. Then, as Dwight Macdonald puts it in his penetrating essay, *The Root is Man,* "The starting point becomes the State," rather than man himself. Macdonald then continues:

> What is not generally understood is that the traditional Progressive approach, taking History as the starting-point and thinking in terms of mass political parties, bases itself on this same alienation of man which it thinks it is combating. It puts the individual into the same powerless, alienated role vis-à-vis the party or the trade union as the manipulators of the modern State do, except that the slogans are different. The current failure of the European masses to get excited about socialist slogans and programs indicates that the masses are, as Rosa Luxemburg constantly and rightly insisted, much smarter and more "advanced" than their intellectual leaders. The brutal fact is that the man in the street everywhere is quite simply *bored* with socialism, as expounded by the Socialist, Stalinist, and Trotskyist epigones of Marx, that he suspects it is just a lot of stale platitudes which either have no particular meaning (Socialists, Trotskyists, British Labor Party), or else a sinister one (Stalinists). Above all, he feels that there is no interest in it for him, as an individual human being—that he is as powerless and manipulated vis-à-vis his socialist mass-organization as he is towards his capitalistic employers and their social and legal institutions.
>
> Those who build their political philosophy on the idea of progress tend to justify the Means by the End, the Present by the Future, the Here by the There. The progressive can swallow war as a Means to the End, peace; he can overlook the unsatisfactory Present by fixing his eyes on a distant and perfect Future, as in the case of the USSR; he can justify the loss of the individual's freedom Here as necessary to a workable organization of society There. He is able to perform these considerable feats of abstract thinking because he, who makes so free with the charge of "metaphysician" and "Utopian," is actually

> the arch-metaphysician of our time, quite prepared to sacrifice indefinitely and on the most grandiose scale the real, material, concrete interests of living human beings on the altar of a metaphysical concept of Progress which he assumes (again metaphysically) is the "real essence" of history.

For all these reasons it can be seen that theosophical opposition to callow definitions of "progressivism" has manifold justification. Not only have numerous original sparks of political idealism been subverted by the rationalization that the present may be justly sacrificed to the future, the individual to the blueprint of a supposedly better social order, but the true meaning of art has been effectively obscured. Though the question of man's love for past great art produced in a "primitive" socio-economic order, occasionally bothered Karl Marx, both he and his followers had categorically rejected the possibility that the most important realities were psychological and individual. Great art expresses eternal verities of the spirit, and may flow from the single genius of a man who transcends the economic and political conditions of his time—simply by living beyond them, paying relatively little attention.

It is at this point, perhaps, that the insistence by H.P.B. that Theosophy be not considered simply a "progressive system of religion" can be best appreciated. Improvements of the social structure—always in order and always worth working for—are nevertheless sound only to the degree that they are based upon a view of man which respects the need for self-induced and self-devised efforts on the part of each individual. True art, genuine civil liberties, and symbolic religion have a close kinship, for unless it be recognized that the most important work of man is his own psychological evolution, society will be controlled by casuist leaders and passive followers. Right becomes might, or—little better—simply the echo of millions of people who say the same things because this is easier than original thinking.

The teachings of Theosophy are certainly oriented around the "idea of progress," but this is recognized in Theosophy as meaning progress of the soul. The reality *of* the soul, however, and all those doctrines, religious symbols, arts, and philosophies which allow the reality of the soul to be more clearly realized, have a timeless value. There is in man a natural longing for belief in that which is permanent, enduring. *Progress* is not, of course, to end with such realization, but rather may be regarded as truly beginning when eternal verities are recognized and correctly identified.

THE ANATHEMAS AGAINST ORIGEN

II

IN the first centuries of our era there existed a vast body of literature that is no longer extant. Many old books are referred to in both Old and New Testaments, others mentioned by historians of that day. The diversity of opinion that prevailed within the early Church will hardly be understood unless this fact be borne in mind—unless it is realized that the sixty or seventy-odd books now comprising the Holy Bible are not the only ones known to, and considered sacred by, the ancient Christians. In addition to the teachings of Jesus, the early Church Fathers had access to Chaldean, Egyptian, Greek and Oriental scriptures, a comparative study of which was pursued within the precincts of the Church. But many of these old works later came to be considered dangerous to the temporal power of the new faith, so that in the fourth century A.D., Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea and so-called "father of Church history," took upon himself the task of censoring and editing the entire body of Holy Writ, Pagan as well as Christian. The result of this ignoble undertaking was that many valuable treatises were destroyed, others perverted beyond recognition. Socrates, a historian of the fifth century, and Syncellus, vice-patriarch of Constantinople (eighth century), both denounced Eusebius as the most daring and desperate forger.

The teachings of Origen, as reflected in the anathemas, are admittedly unorthodox to confirmed Christians of this day. But in his own time, before Christianity had degenerated into a stereotyped creed, they were not so considered. Until the year 553 A.D., the influence of this great teacher was profound, his writings increasingly popular. Why else should the Church feel the need for pronouncing them anathema? With these thoughts in mind, students and scholars will better understand the reason perhaps for the doctrinal differences of opinion that divided the Fathers of the early Church. Some may even be awakened to the need for a complete revaluation of Christian beliefs. It is with this end in view that the following study of the *anathemas* is undertaken.

Anathema No. I

If anyone assert the fabulous preexistence of souls, and shall assert the monstrous restoration which follows from it: let him be anathema.

The doctrine of the pre-existence of souls is one of the oldest known to mankind. Every ancient scripture, without exception, makes reference to this noble idea in one form or another. Almost all of the Oriental peoples believe that they existed as souls before they were born into their present bodily tabernacle, and that they will continue to exist after the event known to us as death. The whole idea of reincarnation, of repeated existences upon earth, is wrapped up inextricably with the principle of pre-existence, and of the restoration of the soul to its former condition after the death of the body. Nor is this idea completely absent from the Bible. In Rom. IX: 10-13, we find St. Paul speaking of Esau and Jacob being actually in existence before they were born:

> And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac;
>
> (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)
>
> As it was written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.

In Proverbs VIII: 22-31, we have Solomon saying that when the earth was made he was present, and that, long before he could have been born as Solomon, his delights were in the habitable parts of earth with the sons of men.

> The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old.
>
> I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.
>
> When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water.
>
> Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth:
>
> When he prepared the heavens, I was there:

Individuals who believe in life *eternal,* in the *immortality* of their souls, will do well to go to the dictionary and ponder the meanings of these terms. For whether one's future be that of eternal damnation, a doctrine viewed with horror by all the philosophical Pagans, or of everlasting bliss, logic demands a *past* of equal immeasurableness. The term "eternal" does not imply endless futurity alone, but means "having neither beginning nor end of existence; infinite in duration." That which ends in time must have had a beginning, and likewise that which is endless is beginningless. But to postulate something with a begin-

ning but *no end,* as Christians do in their concept of immortality, places the mind in the position of trying to imagine an object with one end only—an absurdity. The philosophical inconsistency of this position is avoided only by adoption of Origen's doctrine of pre-existence. By what token, one may argue, is the idea of beginningless and endless Time any better? This, too, is beyond the range and reach of finite thought. True, but there is all the difference in the world. Although the human mind is incapable of conceiving the idea of infinitude, in either Space or Time, the concept, to say the least, is inescapable, whereas the idea of a stick with only one end is illogical, offending every reasoning mind.

Whether one turns to the Epistles of St. Paul, or to any one of the Four Gospels of the New Testament, the usages of the term "eternal" —as, for example, "the inheritance of eternal life,"—will be found to yield a far more philosophical fruitage if understood to imply reabsorption into the One Spirit, the "restoration" of the soul to its own natural state of timelessness, a condition of consciousness without beginning or end, where Past, Present and Future are one. Jesus was asked:

> Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?
>
> And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself.
>
> And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. (Luke x: 25-28.)

In *The Bhagavad-Gita,* Krishna gives similar instruction to his devoted disciple, Arjuna:

> Having obtained this finite, joyless world, worship me. Serve me, fix heart and mind on me, be my servant, my adorer, prostrate thyself before me, and thus, united unto me, at rest, thou shalt go unto me. . . . Assimilation with the Supreme Spirit is on both sides of death for those who are free from desire and anger, temperate, of thoughts restrained; and who are acquainted with the true Self.
>
> (*Bhagavad-Gita*)

> I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.
>
> Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. (Rev. xxii: 13-14.)

THE WORLD SOUL

THE Egg was incorporated as a sacred sign or symbol in the cosmogony of every people on the earth, and was revered for both its form and its inner mystery. From the earliest mental conceptions of man, it was known as that which represents most successfully the origin and secret of being. The gradual development of the imperceptible germ within the closed shell; the inward working, without any apparent outward interference of force, which from a latent *nothing* produced an active *something,* needing naught save heat; and which having gradually evolved into a concrete, living creature, broke its shell, appearing to the outward senses of all a self-generated and self-created being—this must have been a standard miracle from the beginning. The Vishnu Purana relates allegorically: "Intellect (Mahat) . . . the (unmanifested) gross elements inclusive, formed an egg . . . and the lord of the universe himself abided in it, in the character of Brahma. In that egg, O Brahman, were the continents, and seas and mountains, the planets and divisions of the universe, the gods, the demons and mankind."

All proceeds and evolves from primordial matter, considered in the shape of that which is comprehensible to human intellect, the "Mundane Egg." In the Katakopanishad, Purusha, the divine spirit, already stands before the original matter, "from whose union springs the great soul of the world," Maha-Atma, Brahma, the Spirit of Life. All of these are identical with *Anima Mundi,* or the Universal Soul—the "Egg of Darkness." The Egg is also the great Circle. The point and the circle signifies really the point and the sphere. "It is the point in the Mundane Egg, the germ within the latter which will become the universe . . . this germ being latent and active, periodically and by turns." The point (germ, or nucleus) is the *focus,* both radiant and reflective of an Akashic or ethereal sphere. Within that sphere there may be *forms,* both actual and potential, manifest and unmanifest; also radiant *energies* which in like manner are both manifest and unmanifest. The point, "a nucleus of Mother substance," is the heart and the matrix of all the living and existing Forces in our solar universe. It is the Kernel from which proceed, to spread on their cyclic journeys, all the

---

NOTE.—Collated from Theosophical sources.

Powers that set in action the atoms in their functional duties, and the focus within which they again meet in their SEVENTH ESSENCE every eleventh year.

Geometry, of all sciences the only one which proceeds from universals to particulars, was precisely the method employed by Plato in his philosophy. The cosmological theory of numerals which Pythagoras learned from the Egyptian hierophants is alone able to reconcile the two units, spirit and matter, and cause each to demonstrate the other mathematically. The sacred numerals of the universe in their esoteric combination solve the great problem and explain the theory of radiation and the cycle of emanations. It is taught that every cosmogony began with a circle, a point, a triangle, and a cube, up to the number nine, when it was synthesized by the first line and a circle. The latter, the Pythagorean mystic Decade (10, or line and circle), summed all, involved and expressed the mysteries of the entire Kosmos. It is allegorically the Egg breaking in two, "the shell becoming the heaven, the meat in the egg the earth, the white forming the terrestrial waters." Again, "the Egg gives birth to the four *Elements* within the fifth, Ether, and is covered with seven coverings, which become later on the seven upper and the seven lower worlds."

Much space in *The Secret Doctrine* is given to the four Elements. Whence came they? Their symbols, when traced to their source are ever one and the same. The Elements of Plato and Aristotle were the *incorporeal principles* attached to the four great divisions of our cosmic world. They are potencies, Forces; hierarchies which have been classified on a graduated scale of seven from the ponderable to the imponderable. "These hierarchies of Forces are Septenary—not as an artificial aid to facilitate their comprehension—but in their real cosmic graduation, from their chemical (or physical) to their purely spiritual composition. With the hermetic philosopher they are Forces relatively 'blind,' or 'intelligent,' according to which principles in them he deals with. It required long millenniums before they found themselves, in our cultured age, finally degraded into simple chemical elements."

"The abodes of Fohat (Force, Cosmic Energy) are many. He places his four fiery (electro-positive) Sons in the 'Four Circles'." These Circles, it is explained, are the equator, the ecliptic, and the tropics (parallels of declination)—to preside over the *climates* of which are placed the "Four mystical Entities." Primordial substance, before it emerges from the plane of the never-manifesting, and awakens to the

thrill of action under the impulse of Fohat, is but a "cool Radiance, colorless, formless, tasteless, and devoid of every quality and aspect." Even such are her first-born, the "four sons," who "are one, and become Seven." These are the Entities by whose qualifications and names the ancient Eastern Occultists called the four of the seven primal "centres of Forces," or atoms, that later develop into the great Cosmic "Elements," now divided into the sub-elements known to science.

The "Four Maharajas" or great Kings of the Dhyan Chohans preside each over one of the four cardinal points. Belief in the Four Maharajas was universal. They are the Regents or Angels (hierarchical Forces) who rule at the "Angles"—over the cosmical Forces of North, South, East and West—each having a distinct occult property. The ancients never *worshipped* the Elements and the cardinal (imaginary) points, but the "gods" that ruled these respectively—the incorporeal principles placed at each of the four great divisions of our cosmical world to supervise them. These BEINGS are connected with Karma, as the latter needs physical and material agents to carry out her decrees, such as the four kinds of winds, for instance, professedly admitted by science to have their respective evil and beneficent influences upon the health of Mankind and every living thing. There is an occult philosophy in that Roman Catholic doctrine which traces the various public calamities such as epidemics from disease, and wars, and so on, to the invisible "Messengers" from North and West. It is not the "Rector" or "Maharajah" who punishes or rewards, with or without "God's" permission or order, but man himself—his deeds or karma, attracting individually and collectively (as in the case of whole nations sometimes), every kind of evil and calamity: We produce CAUSES, and these awaken the corresponding powers in the sidereal world; which powers are magnetically and irresistibly attracted to, and react upon, those who produced these causes. This, whether such persons are practically evil-doers, or simply Thinkers who brood mischief.

"An army of the Sons of Light stands at each Angle and the *Lipika* in the middle Wheel. Each leads an army of spiritual beings to protect mankind. . . ." The four celestial beings are precisely this. They are the protectors of mankind and also the Agents of Karma on earth. Whereas "the *Lipika* are concerned with Humanity's hereafter."

In Hindu Pantheism the four angels, or genii, of the four quarters of Heaven (the Maharajas) stand each on a lotus—the latter represented as growing out of Vishnu's navel. This is undoubtedly the most

graphic allegory ever made: the universe evolving from the central Sun, the POINT, the ever-concealed germ. For, as soon as DARKNESS—or rather that which is "darkness" for ignorance—has disappeared in its own realm of eternal Light, leaving behind only its divine manifested Ideation, the creative Logoi (Builders) have their understanding opened, and they see in the ideal world (hitherto concealed in the divine thought) the archetypal forms of all, and proceed to copy and build or fashion upon these models, *forms evanescent and transcendent.* The central Sun is Deity—the World Soul. It is Sat, and Saros or cycle, and was the Babylonian god whose circular horizon was the visible symbol of the invisible—Zero-ana. It is also the Chakra or circle of Vishnu. Having its circumference everywhere (the Boundless), it has therefore its central point everywhere; in other words, in every point in the universe. China and her Confucius circumscribes the Great Extreme within a circle with a horizontal line across. Plato and his school never understood Deity otherwise. The ONE, the original, had no existence in the sense applied to it by mortal men. "The honored One dwells in the centre as in the circumference . . ."

Each living centre, formed on a *laya* or balancing point, is a doorway or focus of both inner and outer space, through which the radiant energies play and interchange. The sun as a cosmic and radiant centre is a laya point which forms the gateway between that inner space, which to us is dark and unknown, and this outer space filled with those radiant *Vibrations* which we partly see or feel—which are built into the circling globes and the myriad forms of life which people them. "Around the sun, like an army of satellites, are innumerable choirs of genii. They dwell in the neighborhood of the Immortals, and thence *watch over human beings.* They fulfill the will of the gods (Karma) by means of storms, tempests, transitions of fire and earthquakes; likewise by famines and wars, for the punishment of impiety. It is the sun who preserves and nourishes all creatures. Even as the Ideal World which environs the sensible world fills this last with the plenitude and universal variety of forms, so also the sun, enfolding all in his light, accompanies everywhere the birth and development of creatures, for these are many and diverse, and their number corresponds to that of the stars. Every star has its genii, good and evil by nature, or rather by their operation, for operation is the essence of the genii. All these genii ('gods' or Dhyan Chohans, too) preside over mundane affairs. They shake and overthrow the constitution of States and of individuals.

They imprint their likeness on our Souls, they are present in our nerves, our marrow, our veins, our arteries and our very brain-substance. At the moment when each of us receives life and being, he is taken in charge by the genii (Elementals) who preside over births, and who are classed beneath the astral powers (Superhuman astral Spirits). They change perpetually, not always identically, but *revolving in circles* (cyclic progress in development)."

Connected with the destiny of every man and the birth of every child, *i.e.,* connected with Karma, the Law of Retribution—are the *Lipika.* They are the Recorders or Annalists who impress on the (to us) invisible tablets of the Astral Light—the World Soul— a faithful record of every act, and even thought of man, of all that was, is, or ever will be, in the phenomenal universe. The Lipika—literally "Scribes," from *lipi,* "to write"—are the "Spirits of the Universe." These mystical Beings "stand in the middle Wheel" (the Point?). It is they who project into objectivity from the passive Universal Mind the ideal plan of the universe, upon which the "Builders" reconstruct the Kosmos after every Pralaya. It is they who stand *parallel* to the Seven Angels of the Presence, whom the Christians recognize in the seven "Planetary Spirits" or the "Spirits of the Stars"; for it is they who are the direct amanuenses of the Eternal Ideation—or, as called by Plato, the "Divine Thought."

The divine and unseen canvas, the Book of Life or the eternal Karmic Record, is no fantastic dream, for we meet with the same records in the world of gross matter. The forty "Assessors" who stand in the region of *Amenti* as the accusers of the Soul before Egyptian Osiris, belong to the same class of deities as the *Lipika,* and might stand paralleled, were not the Egyptian gods so little understood in their esoteric meaning. The Hindu *Chitra-Gupta* who reads out of the account of every Soul's life from his register, called Agra-Sandhani; the "Assessors" who read theirs from the heart of the defunct, which becomes an open book whether before Yama, Minos, Osiris, or Karma —are all so many copies of, and variants from the Lipika, and their Astral Records. Connected as they are with every man, whose life is already traced in the Astral Light—not fatalistically, but only because the future, like the past, is ever alive in the Present—they may also be said to exercise an influence on the science of horoscopy. We must admit the truth of the latter whether we will or not. For, as observed by one of the modern adepts of astrology: "Now that photography has

revealed to us the chemical influence of the Sidereal system, by fixing on the sensitized plate of the apparatus milliards of stars and planets that had hitherto baffled the efforts of the most powerful telescopes to discover them, it becomes easier to understand how our solar system can, at the birth of a child, influence his brain—virgin of any impression—in a definite manner and according to the presence on the zenith of such or another sidereal constellation."

Yet Man, epitomizing all, is "composed of all the great Elements." Beyond even "the Recorder" stand the primordial Seven Beings, the first emanation of the divine thought, "Fohat, the swift Son of the Divine Sons—whose sons are the Lipika." "The Lipika circumscribe the Triangle"—*i.e.,* circumscribe the manifested world of matter within the "Circle" ("Ring-pass-not"). The Pleiades, as is known, are the central group of the system of sidereal symbology. They are situated in the neck of the constellation of *Taurus*—in astronomy, *the central group* of the system of the Milky Way; in the Kabala and Eastern Esotericism, *the sidereal Septenate* born from the first manifested side of the upper *Triangle,* the concealed. This manifested side of *Taurus,* the symbol of One (figure 1), whose synthesis is ten (10), the perfect letter and number. Pleiades (Alcyone, especially), are thus considered, even in astronomy, as the *central point* around which our universe of fixed stars revolves, the *focus* from which, and into which the divine breath, MOTION, works incessantly during the Manvantara. Hence in the Occult philosophy and its sidereal symbols it is this Circle and the starry cross on its face, which play the most important part.

The Soul of the World is the ALL. From Gods to men, from Worlds to atoms, from a star to a rush-light, from the sun to the vital heat of the meanest organic being—the world of Form and Existence is an immense chain, whose links are all connected. The law of analogy is the first key to world-problems, and these links have to be studied coordinately in their occult relation to each other. All grows and develops and strives toward perfection on the planes of externality, or is "ever-becoming." But on the ultimate plane of the spiritual essence all IS, and remains therefore immutable. It is toward this eternal *Esse* that every thing, as every being, is gravitating, gradually, almost imperceptibly, but as surely as the universe of stars and worlds moves towards a mysterious point known to, yet still unnamed by, astronomy, and called by the Occultists—the *central Spiritual Sun.*

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WHY do people seem under the compulsion to be deceitful, and therefore hypocritical, in their interpersonal relations? Does Theosophical philosophy have anything to add to the explanations supplied by psychologists?

(*a*) While psychologists in general are concerned with the personality and personality disorders, the Theosophic view deals with man as a *septenary* being, with special emphasis on the egoic faculties. From this vantage-point, the personality, which may become a seat of hypocrisy and deceit, is considered as a subordinate vehicle through which egoic consciousness can operate—not as the *center* of man's consciousness. The compulsion commonly witnessed in societal man to be deceitful, originates from ignorance of man's true nature. The common emphasis in society is adjustment to the prevailing environment in terms of "keeping up with the Joneses"; the Theosophic emphasis is constructive adjustment to all circumstances from the basis of one's higher self.

The Higher Ego, obviously, knows naught of deceit, pride, ambition, and the like. But as human beings we consist of personality as well as individuality, and the job is that of refining the former and harmoniously blending the two. In attempting to "live the life," the various aspects of our natures are to be understood and guided.

The personality, if made the center of man's concentration, is concerned with likes and dislikes, and therefore, to the extent that a person is identified with it, he will be governed by its compulsive energies. Maturity, as both psychologists and Theosophists will agree, consists in outgrowing purely personal preoccupations by a broadening sense of responsibility for family, nation, and mankind in general.

The explanations for compulsive personality trends, furnished by psychologists, center more or less around the analysis of unbalanced emotional conditions in childhood and adolescence—conditions which create strong, and often insatiable, "needs" that manifest in various alarming symptoms. This view, in general, is not in opposition to Theosophic teachings, but leaves out of account the ability of the awakening ego to at least modify, if not transform, some of these "needs" in worthwhile directions.

As a footnote in a lighter vein, Thoreau had the following to say about deceit:

> Society is commonly too cheap. We meet at very short intervals, not having had time to acquire any new value for each other. We meet at meals three times a day, and give each other a new taste of that old musty cheese that we are. We have had to agree on a certain set of rules, called etiquette and politeness, to make this frequent meeting tolerable and that we need not come to open war.

(*b*) In his never-ending search for the answers to life, man turns first in one direction then in another, looking for fulfilment. In his journeyings through the contemporary world, his actions and motives are naturally influenced by his environment. Today's civilization has done much to foster the compulsions mentioned—as Dr. Karen Horney pointed out in *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time.*

The fear of getting hurt, primarily a result of the *personal* desire to get ahead, is undoubtedly one of the psychological causes of such an attitude. If, however, this reaction is a direct result of society's influence on its component parts, then why don't all individuals have these compulsions? Surely we can grant that all of us, within our circle of experience, have come into contact with individuals whose sunny dispositions and straight-forward manner have commanded our good will.

Approaching this problem from a philosophical standpoint, all hinges on whether it is possible to attain, in a finite sense, a conscious realization of the purpose of life. Let us accept the postulate that man, once given a logical reason to pursue a course of action—one that he accepts—will go ahead with it. This may not necessarily be so, but until he reaches this stage of his own volition, nothing can be accomplished. All one can do is appeal to whatever little reason is present. All are searching, whether conscious of it or not, but, due to outside influences, man has a tendency to veil his strivings from others. This only leads to a drawing within one's self more and more. The twentieth century Westerner has not yet found a solution. But, given a purpose in life which enables fulfilment of himself and makes him feel closer to others, he will naturally attempt to pursue it; and put an end to his circle of suffering.

The Theosophical Movement exists at the present time for just that purpose. At the time when materialistic civilization is at its height, the aspiring nature of man needs, and has, a guide.

"'Why should I ask God to make me good when I want to be naughty?' asked the little girl. All the wise men of the world are put to silence by this question." (The Human Situation.) *How do you answer this?*

God, here, as is usually the case, represents the creator of life and man, and we are to ask for all that is "good" from him—as a very young child asks his parents for help when he doesn't understand. The terms of "good" and "evil" are defined by society and church, and there is nothing left for the individual to decide. For one who just wants to be very simple about life and seeks to be good, this pattern of asking to be "made" good suits him fairly well. But for the one who does not want to be good, wherever or whenever the reasons for "goodness" seem to hold no real value or happiness for him, there is another problem that is not taken care of by asking God for help—because what the child wants is not what God, presumably, thinks he *should* want. Yet, why should the things that the child wishes and finds enjoyment in be the things that God finds evil or bad? And even if they are bad, why, as the little girl says, should she ask someone to make her good when she finds happiness in some things called "bad"? "Good" and "bad" cannot be defined in the absolute terms of black and white. Goodness depends upon many factors and reasons. The little girl might sense this, and see that at times, perhaps more often than not, some "good" exists in the seeming evil, and vice versa.

The irrepressible urge to discover life for one's self, and at the same time be annoyed at all the alarms and cautions and conservatisms of the older generation, may be an integral part of growth; the young person attempts to unfold—wants to know what life has to offer him, and what *he* has to offer life. Also, it isn't natural for a young person to take the safer way if it holds no adventure for him. Because he is involved with his own thoughts, joys, and sorrows, authority of any kind is not welcome. He wants to find things out for himself. Then, too, the picture of supposed "goodness" which greets the eye of a young person is one of steadfast habits: conservatism, moralism, and a bit of pessimism. This picture holds no interest for one who is just beginning life. It will get him nowhere.

If a young person does not agree with the wishes or convictions of those who are said to know more than he, he does not know why he feels or thinks the way he does, nor why he can't come out with the

same solutions as the adult, the same *convictions* of right and wrong. He is still in the process of gathering his mental, psychic, and physical faculties under conscious supervision, and so is incapable of the conviction of "truth" he may later enjoy as he sees more, and goes through more of life's sorrows and happiness.

A society has its definite functions and advantages to offer the young person, but it should not, and cannot, give anyone an inner sense of beauty, truth, and happiness. Growing, in large part, is an independent and individual process. What is developed and learned is according to each person's capacity for assimilating at that particular time. A good teacher encourages the young person to develop those qualities that will enable him to discern truth in whatever shape it comes to him —but "goodness" is supposed truth already *defined*. To expect the young person to be as aware of some points and matters, and see their importance as well as the older person who has been around quite a bit longer, is unnatural.

I think, too, that if one requires that a young person take one particular attitude toward some matter, this shows no real trust in the young person's ability to struggle around with a problem for a while and then come up with a pretty good answer—also one that is truly his own. There are as many ways to figure out an answer or code of morals as there are people in the world. So that what might seem wrong, or even bad, to someone observing, might very well be quite the opposite, or at least harmless, because of the many conditions and phases of the situation and, of course, the attitudes of the people involved in the matter. It is always good to remember that an act, in itself, is never good or bad, only the reason for choosing that particular way of doing something.

Perhaps, though, what would be close to ideal, for either young or old, is to meet the problem somewhere in the middle; that is, to look seriously and deeply into the convictions and wishes and modes of life of the elders and take what one can, and combine this with one's own inner "knowledge" and views on the matter. This would help to round out the picture, and give us a better chance at learning. Actually, I think this is all that any adult or authority should ask of one who is trying to find his way in this very mixed-up world. The young person does not like to fool himself about anything; so he will gradually move toward what is good and true according to the *karma* of his incarnation.

A PERENNIAL ISSUE

AN issue looming large on almost every page of the history of the present-day Theosophical Movement is that of "the Theosophical Movement" versus Theosophical organizations. It must be evident, though, that such an issue could not be peculiar to the latest centenary effort. For even a cursory study of previous presentations of Wisdom-Religion reveals inevitable struggle between Spirit and Form; the present-day problem is thus seen to be but a cyclic recurrence of like struggles in the remote past.

In *The Bhagavad-Gita,* Krishna calls Arjuna's attention to this issue at the very outset and warns him against falling a prey to it, observing that Arjuna's "sentiments are those of the expounders of the letter of the law." The purely formal aspect of respected wisdom is here called "letter of the law." The latter term was also used by Paul in II Cor. 2:6—"Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." That this issue was an ancient one even when *The Bhagavad-Gita* was recorded, may be deduced from the following words of Krishna, where the term "Vedas" is to be understood as referring to forms of scripture which have become stereotyped and highly organized religions:

> When thy heart shall have worked through the snares of delusion, then thou wilt attain to high indifference as to those doctrines which are already taught or which are yet to be taught. When thy mind once liberated from the Vedas shall be fixed immovably in contemplation, then shalt thou attain to devotion.

In *The Key to Theosophy* subsection, "The Abstract and the Concrete," H.P.B. emphasizes this same distinction ever to be borne in mind by "all her pupils that they may learn and teach in their turn." Some of her words are:

> The Society is a great body of men and women, composed of the most heterogeneous elements. Theosophy, in its abstract meaning, is Divine Wisdom, or the aggregate of the knowledge and wisdom that underlie the Universe—the homogeneity of eternal GOOD; and in its concrete sense it is the sum total of the same as allotted to man by nature, on this earth, and no more. . . . The Society can be regarded as the embodiment of Theosophy only in its abstract motives; it can

> never presume to call itself its concrete vehicle so long as human imperfections and weaknesses are all represented in its body; otherwise the Society would be only repeating the great error and the outflowing sacrileges of the so-called Churches of Christ. If Eastern comparisons may be permitted, Theosophy is the shoreless ocean of universal truth, love, and wisdom, reflecting its radiance on the earth, while the Theosophical Society is only a visible bubble on that reflection. Theosophy, finally, is the fixed eternal sun, and its Society the evanescent comet trying to settle in an orbit to become a planet, ever revolving within the attraction of the sun of truth. It was formed to assist in showing to men that such a thing as Theosophy exists, and to help them to ascend towards it by studying and assimilating its eternal verities.

The issue of "Movement versus Society" manifested itself very early in Theosophical history, especially in 1889, as the result of Richard Harte's several articles appearing in the *Theosophist* of which Col. Olcott was now chief editor. (This phase of Theosophical history has received full treatment in *The Theosophical Movement,* Chap. xiii.) We reproduce here a typical passage from one of Harte's articles entitled "Applied Theosophy." It illustrates where the loss of one's spiritual orientation will finally lead to; and it foreshadowed where the followers of the Society *as such* have been led to, as, for example, the founding by reputed Theosophists of a new sect, The Liberal Catholic Church, with all the paraphernalia of sacerdotalism. Here is what Harte wrote:

> Who speaks when a priest of the Roman Catholic Church utters a command? *The united power of the Church of Rome.* Who speaks when a disfrocked priest says anything? *A nonentity.* Who speaks when the Judge, the General, the Statesman open their mouths? "The State"—the tremendous and often tyrannical personality that comes into life and action when the units that compose it are bound together, through organization, by a common will and a common purpose.

The comment on this on page 181 of *The Theosophical Movement* is as follows:

> This idea that it is only "through organization," through making the *Society* the prime object of devotion, with its "authority" through the voice of its officials supreme over the individual conscience and action, that "applied Theosophy" can be a success, is argued at length, reaching, finally, its culmination in the suggestion that the Adyar Headquarters must be made a second Rome, and, by implication, the President-Founder of the Society a Theosophical Pope!

Richard Harte's proposals received prompt attention from both H.P.B. and Mr. Judge. How Judge met the challenge can be seen from the following, taken from an article written on this occasion:

> And let me tell the writer of "Applied Theosophy" that on an occasion many years ago when the then form of Constitution seemed to conflict with our "order" received, causing hesitation on the part of Col. Olcott, a message was delivered from the same source saying, "If the Constitution conflicts with your duty as laid down in your orders, then tear up the Constitution." The progress of the movement, which has to do with realities, with the deep unseen springs of human action, must not be impeded by blind obedience to fixed Constitutions, nor by Rules long drawn out and verbose in their effort to deal with every imaginable contingency. (*Theosophical Movement,* p. 185fn.)

In an article in *Lucifer* entitled "A Puzzle from Adyar," H.P.B. met this challenge with characteristic firmness, yet withal in the spirit of true brotherhood. Here are some quotations from this article:

> It is pure nonsense to say that "H.P.B. . . . is loyal to the Theosophical Society and to *Adyar*" (!?). H.P.B. *is loyal to death to the Theosophical* CAUSE, *and those great Teachers whose philosophy can alone bind the whole of Humanity into one Brotherhood. . . .* Therefore the degree of her sympathies with the "Theosophical Society and Adyar" depends upon the degree of loyalty of that Society to the CAUSE. Let it break away from the original lines and show disloyalty in its policy to the CAUSE and the original programme of the Society, and H.P.B. calling the T.S. *disloyal,* will shake it off like dust from her feet.
>
> And what does "loyalty to Adyar" mean, in the name of all wonders? What *is* Adyar, apart from that CAUSE and the *two* (not *one* Founder, if you please) who represent it? (THEOSOPHY 15: 25.)

The epoch-making nature of this article in a literal sense—that of opening a new cycle in the history of the Movement—is evident from a memorable declaration toward the close.

H.P.B.'s final words foreshadow what must and will inevitably happen if the cleavage between the protagonists remains unhealable:

> There is no longer a "Parent Society"; it is abolished and replaced by an aggregate body of Theosophical Societies, *all autonomous,* as are the States of America, and all under one Head President, who, together with H. P. Blavatsky, will champion the CAUSE against the whole world. Such is the real state of things. (THEOSOPHY 15: 26.)
>
> Let the new Exoteric Theosophical Society headed by Mr. Harte, play at red tape if the President lets them and let the General

> Council expel me for "disloyalty," if again, Colonel Olcott should be so blind as to fail to see where the "true friend" and his duty lie. Only unless they hasten to do so, at the first sign of *their* disloyalty to the CAUSE—it is I who will have resigned my office of Corresponding Secretary for life and left the Society. This will not prevent me from remaining at the head of those—who will follow me. (THEOSOPHY 15: 28.)

After this, the issue of the Cause versus the Society assumed a quieter tone. However, the snake was scotched rather than destroyed, and the issue came to active life again after the passing of H.P.B.; and this time the struggle centered around William Q. Judge and the "Judge Case." The inevitable karmic sequel of this struggle was a parting of the ways for two embattled Forces; what happened bore out the truth of one of the Golden Precepts of *The Voice of the Silence*: "The Self of Matter and the SELF of Spirit can never meet. One of the twain must disappear; there is no place for both." The American Section of the T.S., at its Convention held at Boston on April 28-29, 1895, declared its entire autonomy and reorganized as "The Theosophical Society in America." (For a full account of these stirring events the reader is referred to Chapters XV, XVI and XVII of *The Theosophical Movement.*) Here we quote a few passages bearing directly on the subject of this article, originally contained in a letter signed by William Q. Judge, as President of the newly organized American Society, and addressed to the European Theosophists in Convention assembled as "The European Section of the Theosophical Society."

> BROTHERS AND SISTERS:—We send you our fraternal greeting, and fullest sympathy in all works sincerely sought to be performed for the good of Humanity. Separated though we are from you by very great distance we are none the less certain that you and we, as well as all other congregations of people who love Brotherhood, are parts of that great whole denominated The Theosophical Movement, which began far back in the night of Time and has since been moving through many and various peoples, places and environments. That grand work does not depend upon forms, ceremonies, particular persons or set organizations,—"Its unity throughout the world does not consist in the existence and action of any single organization, but depends upon the similarity of work and aspiration of those in the world who are working for it." Hence organizations of theosophists must vary and change in accordance with place, time, exigency and people. To hold that in and by a sole organization for the whole world is the only way to work would be boyish in conception and not in accord with experience or nature's laws.

> Let us then press forward together in the great work of the real Theosophical Movement which is aided by working organizations, but is above them all. Together we can devise more and better ways for spreading the light of truth through all the earth. Mutually assisting and encouraging one another we may learn how to put Theosophy into practice so as to be able to teach and enforce it by example before others. We will then each and all be members of that Universal Lodge of Free and Independent Theosophists which embraces every friend of the human race. (*Theosophical Movement,* pp. 252, 253.)

Although those to whom this letter was addressed never realized its important character, Mr. Judge's appeal was not in vain, and when the time came its principles and ideas were adopted as the true modulus of Theosophical work, and were incorporated in a written declaration. This did not occur until 1909, when students *"Whose minds became plastic by the buffetings of experience,"* through the initiative and under the inspiration of Robert Crosbie, founded "The United Lodge of Theosophists." Shortly before the formation of this Association, Robert Crosbie drew up a preliminary prospectus addressed "To All Open-Minded Theosophists," from which we quote:

> The unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is SIMILARITY OF AIM, PURPOSE, AND TEACHING. The acceptance of this principle by all Theosophists would at once remove all barriers. . . .
>
> To give this spirit expression requires a declaration, and a name by which those making the declaration may be known. . . .
>
> The phrase used by one of the Messengers is significant, and avoids all conflict with organizations, being capable of including all without detriment to any. That phrase is:
>
> THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS
>
> The binding spiritual force of this principle of brotherhood needs no such adventitious aids as Constitution or By-Laws—or Officers to administer them. With *it* as basis for union, no possible cause for differences could arise; no room is found here for leader or authority, for dogma or superstition, and yet—as there are stores of knowledge left for all—the right spirit must bring forth from "Those who never fail" all necessary assistance. The door seems open for those who *would,* but cannot see a way. Any considerable number, *living, thinking, acting, upon this basis,* must form a spiritual focus, from which all things are possible. (*The Friendly Philosopher, pp.* 410-11.)

Although there now exists a body of students all over the world who proclaim devotion above all else to the "cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization,"

the issue of the Movement versus *any* particular vehicle is by no means settled. The tendency to attach undue importance to doctrinal phrasings seems to be inherent in human nature in the present arc of the evolutionary cycle, and so needs to be constantly guarded against. Eternal vigilance is the price in this respect, as it is with liberty.

As illustrative of this tendency to think that Truth is best served through organizations, there appeared in the Dec. 1, 1954, issue of the weekly periodical, *Manas,* a letter from "A Reader" proposing the formation of "an organized group as our churches are organized, with well-qualified and well-paid leaders, and eventually with adequate schools or courses of study to train and equip the leaders, to the end that they may present to lay members the best thinking of all times in religious, philosophical and mystical fields, and give such assistance as they can in synthesizing that which is acceptable, with current knowledge and ideas in other fields." The "Editors' Reply" mentioned three movements which approximated in some measure the sort of organization this reader had in view. We quote that part of the reply which deals with the Theosophical Movement:

> The Theosophical Movement differs from these two groups [the Ethical Culture and the Humanist movements] in that it offers a theory of knowledge involving transcendental assumptions about the nature of things. Theosophy, according to its chief nineteenth-century exponent, Madame Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, is characterized by belief in the eternal existence of the *Gnosis*—actual knowledge or wisdom concerning the nature of things. While Theosophy declared uncompromising opposition to the supernaturalism of a personal God, it proposed that all men were possessed of latent deific powers, and could ultimately become "Masters of Wisdom." This philosophical position, however, when sloganized by immature members, created extreme hazards for the Theosophical Society, since those who were to all appearance ordinary human beings eventually were found implying that they had attained to spiritual heights not yet reached by the common herd, and entitled therefore, to special recognition as Theosophical authorities. In consequence of this development, splits occurred in the Society, until there were three schismatic groups, organized more or less like churches, each claiming to be the true channel of inspiration. It was inevitable that the educated public should show little respect for a movement displaying such self-discrediting behavior. What happened in this instance should hardly be regarded as surprising, since whenever transcendental ideas of great subtlety are promoted by *group* enthusiasm, the ideas tend to be vitiated into a creed by the very language of the "joiners." From this grows

the authority of "group" beliefs. This record should be instructive, for there is little or no basis for any sort of religious authoritarianism in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, which are rather a searching inquiry into ancient religions much in the manner proposed by our correspondent. Thus the history of the Theosophical Movement should be a useful "case-history" to refer to when contemplating the proposal of an organization devoted to the quest for philosophical truth. It is one thing to set up a principle of "no authority," but quite another to make it stand, especially when the goal is human development. At any rate, the continuing vigor of the Theosophical Movement seems to reside mostly in the efforts of relatively unorganized individuals who are pursuing their studies and work without interest in organizational authorities, or in spite of them.

An Unusual Prayer

Incomprehensible Father of all!
Do not deprive me of temptation
Lest my strength weaken and wane.
Deliver me not from evil,
Which is of my own construction,
But rather let me strive to conquer
That which none has thrust upon me.
And for my trespasses:
Let me cancel them out
By generosity to those trespassing against me.
For the godhead that resides in me,
Being derived from Thee,
I conceive must be exercised
Lest it be withdrawn for want of use.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Karma of Nonsense

An article in the *Saturday Review* for Aug. 6, "The Great Saucer Hunt," provides several unwelcome illustrations of how thoroughly "lunatic-fringe" exploiters can prejudice intellectuals against the name Theosophy. The author, Siegfried Mandel, in his discussion of the "saucer craze," effectively ridicules volumes such as George Adamski's *Flying Saucers Have Landed* and Cedric Allingham's *Flying Saucers From Mars.* Since these books are full of pseudo-theosophical gibberish—or should we say pseudo-pseudo?—Mr. Mandel drifts into some discrediting allegations about Theosophy itself. We quote:

> One way for a reader to test the degree of nonsense contained in a typical book of saucers is to examine its bibliography carefully. There one discovers that there is a mutual admiration society among flying-saucer writers who cross-reference one another for substantiation. Another curious and significant characteristic is the number of works on theosophy that are earnestly cited. Theosophists, you will recall, claim a special insight into divine nature through special revelation. Their ideas, traceable back to Oriental magic-mystic teachings, were popularized in the United States from the 1870s on by Helena Petrovna Blavatsky and her 100,000 followers. It has been their custom through the years to ride on the coat-tails of the latest unexplained phenomena in the news. At one time they achieved revelation through mesmerism, then magnetism and electricity, and now they have pounced on the saucer and gravitational fields.

Who is Really to Blame?

Considering that the most highly publicized "theosophical literature" since the death of H. P. Blavatsky has often contained weird speculations, radically departing from the original works, there is some excuse for Mr. Mandel's errors in characterizing "Theosophists." Another series of paragraphs in point from "The Great Saucer Hunt":

> According to Adamski, on frequent trips in the spaceships he has received divine instructions from "the master," meaning some extra-galactic swami. Typical is this bit of information he reports in one of this books:
>
> "After the crucifixion of Jesus, who was sent (from Venus) to be incarnated in your world to help your people, as had others before him, we decided to carry on our mission in a way less perilous to those concerned than actual birth on your planet."

Such a reincarnation may seem to be a novel idea, but actually it is a repetition of a doctrine propounded by theosophists decades ago. For thirty years Adamski has been dabbling in telepathy, teaching "natural laws" to a group of disciples, and retailing dream premonitions. Now he has hitched them on to space flights and flying saucers and found a bigger audience than he was able to reach before.

Corrections Difficult to Make

One particularly sad thing about the suggestion that the outlandish doctrine cited was "propounded by theosophists decades ago" is that Mr. Mandel's assertion is true: Annie Besant, among others, at one period of her life dipped far enough below sanity to write about personal communications from "planetary beings." Unless we insist that the word Theosophist—at least when used with a capital letter—be reserved for those who take Madame Blavatsky's writings seriously and attempt no fanatical embellishments, not much can be said about allegations of this type. As indicated by H.P.B. a Theosophist may be either a speculative philosopher or a man of pure faith in doctrine—but the logic and ethics of the two will not properly mix. Speculation from doctrines rather than from philosophical principles built the compendiums of nonsense to which Mr. Mandel refers.

Towards Responsible Journalism

A letter from the editors of Theosophy to the *Saturday Review* and Mr. Mandel, however, endeavors to make clear this important distinction. The letter reads as follows:

Mr. Norman Cousins
Editor, The Saturday Review
25 West 45th Street
New York 36, New York

Dear Mr. Cousins:

Siegfried Mandel's "The Great Saucer Hunt" stands in need of correction. Assertions made therein regarding the beliefs of Theosophists and the writings of H. P. Blavatsky are inaccurate, uninformed, and hence regrettably irresponsible. For example: Mandel writes that Theosophists, in an effort "to ride on the coat-tails of the latest unexplained phenomena in the news . . . have pounced on the saucer and gravitational fields." None of the Theosophists of our acquaintance—by which we mean students of the writings of Madame Blavatsky—have fallen for the Adamski-Allingham line. And this for a very simple reason: Blavatsky's discussion of possible interplanetary communication sums up with a negative, adducing a number

of reasons why such communication and travel should not be expected, even if one grants the likelihood of some forms of intelligence existing on other planetary bodies.

Our own journal THEOSOPHY, carried one negative discussion of the saucer craze (December, 1952), deriving from a *Satevepost* piece which was itself *favorable* to the possibility of interplanetary communication and travel. Neither Adamski's nor Allinghams's books have been approved in THEOSOPHY, or even taken seriously enough to provoke a review—although we have naturally regretted both authors' obvious borrowings and manglings of Blavatsky's books—which give rise to just such misguided impressions as those Mr. Mandel passes on.

Recently we noted that *The Canadian Theosophist,* an official organ of the Theosophical Society in Canada, similarly disavowed Theosophists' alleged addiction to belief in interplanetary nonsense. An article by Cecil Williams, July-August, 1955, reads in part as follows:

"The student of occultism realises that the difficulties of *physical* space travel are insuperable, and that mediumistic claims to have contacted men from Mars or any other planet have no more validity than other statements in trance, which are nearly always based on suggestion, given to the medium by himself or received from another. A medium is in a condition akin to hypnotic trance and we know that hypnotized persons will believe anything.

"Yet there is too much evidence to admit of reasonable doubt that strange lights and forms have appeared in the heavens, and from the description of the most trustworthy witnesses it seems probable that flying saucers are phenomena akin to the electro-magnetic northern lights and to fire-balls. Their prevalence at this time is probably due to the earth's passing through the critical geological period which is producing world-wide aberrations in weather and will in time affect all nations much more seriously."

In another portion of Mr. Mandel's article he quotes some Adamski gibberish about messages from an "extra-galactic swami," then states that this notion of occult instruction was "propounded by Theosophists decades ago." *Not* by any serious student of Madame Blavatsky, nor by any persons known to us!

We are sending a carbon of this communication to Mr. Mandel, care of the *Saturday Review,* and trust that both Mr. Mandel and yourself will recognize the need for a revision of the careless innuendo contained in "The Great Saucer Hunt." The basic point of protest, we may say, is not so much that "We Theosophists" have been maligned, but that public misstatements in regard to the attitudes of *any* group should be carefully avoided, and, if not avoided, corrected.

Very truly yours,
Editors, THEOSOPHY

Other Recent Allusions to Madame Blavatsky

Focus on the Unknown, by Alfred Bennett is called to the attention of our readers because it treats Theosophy and H. P. Blavatsky with at least a measure of respect, and is now being featured on library shelves. This is a fascinating book, semi-finalist for the Atlantic Non-Fiction Award, 1952-53, which, when picked up because of some specific interest, is likely to be read in full. Mr. Bennett writes on a peculiar variety of subjects, some of which are of interest to Theosophists: the kraken, fabulous deep-sea monster, mermaids, giant insects, possible life-forms on other planets, the probable beginning of life on this planet, interplanetary flight, psychic phenomena, dreams, life after death, Patanjali, Yoga and Yogis. The reader of *Focus on the Unknown* will encounter such statements as the following:

> It was a woman—Madame Helena Blavatsky—who, partly as a consequence of travelling in the East, became one of the foremost exponents of the doctrine of theosophy (as did the late Mrs. Annie Besant, theosophy's most active contemporary propagandist)—many of the tenets of which she (Madame Blavatsky) claimed to have derived directly from the fountain-head of the Cult. She founded the Theosophical Society in the United States in 1875; and at least one of her many works on the subject, though it met with a very mixed reception outside the circle of initiates for whom, one supposes, it was primarily intended, remains one of the most remarkable publications of its kind in existence.
>
> As I have previously intimated, many persons looked upon Madame Blavatsky as a charlatan, and wrote and spoke derogatorily about her alleged knowledge of occult matters; but I suspect that, like many prophets, she had appeared in advance of her time, and the passing of the years has not entirely dimmed her unique reputation.
>
> This reference to the Yogic power of transporting articles at will does much to explain those phenomena produced by Madame Blavatsky herself, and which, perhaps more than anything else, later caused her to be unjustly labelled a charlatan and impostor. Indeed, the mere idea of trickery in connection with the high science of Yoga, interpreting the Laws of the Cosmos, is an insult.

While judgments of this sort fall short of an adequate estimate of H.P.B.'s work and true stature, they are at least not acrimonious. Although Mr. Bennett does not subscribe to the theory of reincarnation, he is not prejudiced against it. "Indeed," he says, "granted the existence of some indestructible life-force in every individual, it has always appealed to me as being a very plausible theory."

No Personal Immortality

That Mr. Bennett does not grant the existence of the Higher Ego is the more surprising in view of his sympathetic treatment of Yogis and Yogi powers. He speculates on the after-death state:

> For reasons which it would be inappropriate to enter into here in any detail, I do not believe in the Life-after-death, except, perhaps —and I am going to try to show that this exception is one of paramount importance and significance—as an ever dimming and fading panorama of dreams and impressions, in which Past, Present, and what was once the Future, are all jumbled together one on top of the other till, finally, they become individually and separately as unrecognizable and meaningless as would become hundreds of lantern-slides projected on a screen, one after another and one on top of another.
>
> And as the screen itself would gradually be blacked-out by the ever-increasing number of slides occulting more and more of the illuminant behind them; so, gradually, under the ever-increasing number, pressure, and confusion of dreams will the screen of memory be blacked-out and the last vestiges of the light of consciousness, and the Id [or the Ego, its accrued experiences, and its chaotic desires] (the three elements of which the human mind consists)—be extinguished in ourselves. . . .

Personal Soul Lasts only through Devachan

Theosophists naturally, and probably quite rightly, tend to emphasize the Egoic aspect of the dual function of the devachanic period: the distillation by the Higher Ego of the *efflorescence* of the personality—that which is worthy of becoming one with it. Yet, H.P.B. makes some very positive statements regarding the dissolution of the personal soul in devachan (*Key,* pp. 107, 108):

> An "entity" is immortal, but is so only in its ultimate essence, not in its individual form. . . .
>
> As to the *personal* Soul—by which we mean the spark of consciousness that preserves in the Spiritual Ego the idea of the personal "I" of the last incarnation—this lasts, as a separate distinct recollection, only throughout the Devachanic period. . . . The Soul of man (*i.e.,* of the personality) *per se* is neither immortal, eternal nor divine.
>
> Immortality is but one's unbroken consciousness; and the *personal* consciousness can hardly last longer than the personality, can it? And such consciousness, as I already told you, survives only throughout Devachan, after which it is reabsorbed, first in the *individual,* and then in the *universal* consciousness.

"What Do They Believe?"

Under the above title *Look* for March 22 concludes a series of articles regarding the persuasions of Americans on religious and philosophical subjects. Jerome Nathanson, representing the New York Society for Ethical Culture, in this issue presents a point of view so clearly reminiscent of that encouraged by H. P. Blavatsky in the Theosophical Society that it certainly deserves special mention in these columns.

Mr. Nathanson's best passages begin with the following paragraph:

> Strange though it may seem, most of the millions who do not go to church *are* religious. Many have a profound faith in God; they simply do not believe that any existing organized religion is a satisfactory expression of God's will. They cannot overlook the many differing conceptions of God—from Christianity to Buddhism and the other great religions of the East. The monotheism of Jews is not the same as the Trinitarian conception of Christians. The Protestant conception of man's relation to God is so different from that of the Catholic that it was one of Luther's chief reasons for revolting from Rome. Baptist conceptions of faith and worship differ as much from the Episcopalian as that of the Lutherans differs from the Mormon.

Unorganized Concepts of God

> There are many conceptions of God: Matthew Arnold thought of God as the Power-not-ourselves which makes for good; William James believed in a limited but growing God, who needs our help in making the good more prevalent; Henri Bergson spoke of the creative force which expresses itself in the evolutionary process. Some scientists speak of a "cosmic consciousness" which gives meaning to existence. Some philosophers believe in an absolute moral law, embedded in the very structure of the universe. But how many of these conceptions are organized into a formal church with a rigid ritual and set ideas about sin or salvation?
>
> Have the 64,000,000 Americans who refuse formal expressions of belief anything in common—except the fact that they do not go to church? Yes. They share an important attitude—the idea that it is possible to be "religious," moral, decent, without joining a group and worshiping *en masse*. They believe the individual can get as close to the idea of God as any cleric or institution can bring him. They hold the high faith that men are responsible for what they do with their lives. They do not feel the need for "official" forgiveness or rituals or catechisms to make them men of virtue. They try to lead a life which is honorable, productive, satisfying, right and good—for *them*. (It may or may not be right or good for someone else.) They believe, as have some of the greatest men the human race has produced,

that personal morality is not dependent on organized religion, or on regular attendance at church.

Is it bad for our country that so many Americans hold this independent attitude? The Founding Fathers did not think so: They created the First Amendment to the Constitution for the specific purpose of letting each man have the right to his own form of worship—or his own independence from religious groups.

"Most Devoted Members"

With the background of Mr. Nathanson's remarks in mind, a portion of the recently produced H.P.B. pamphlet *What is Theosophy?—Its Nonsectarian Spirit,* comes into particularly clear focus. There she wrote that "it may sound odd and paradoxical, but it is true to say that, hitherto, the most apt workers in practical theosophy, its most devoted members, were those recruited from the ranks of agnostics and even of materialists. No genuine, no sincere searcher after truth can ever be found among the *blind* believers in the 'Divine Word,' let the latter be claimed to come from Allah, Brahma or Jehovah, or their respective Kuran, Purana and Bible. For 'faith is not *reason's* labour, but repose.' He who believes his own religion on faith, will regard that of every other man as a lie, and hate it on that same faith. Moreover, unless it fetters reason and entirely blinds our perceptions of anything outside our own particular faith, the latter is no faith at all, but a temporary belief, the delusion we labour under, at some particular time of life."

The doctrines of Theosophy, if seriously studied, call forth, by stimulating one's reasoning powers and awakening the *inner* in the animal man, every hitherto dormant power for good in us, and also the perception of the true and the real, as opposed to the false and the unreal. Tearing off with no uncertain hand the thick veil of dead-letter with which old religious scriptures were cloaked, scientific Theosophy, learned in the cunning symbolism of the ages, reveals to the scoffer at old wisdom the origin of the world's faiths and sciences. It opens new vistas beyond the old horizons of crystallized, motionless and despotic faiths.

An Ancient Vision Revived

Particularly notable in the Nathanson article is this portion of its conclusion—which certainly speaks for itself:

The nonconformist need not feel guilty. He is following some of the greatest visions of the human spirit—the Hebrew prophets, Socrates and Jesus, to name a few who sought dignity without dogma.

There is an *ancient vision* which can be revived for our common benefit. For however each of us may make his peace with the universe,

our faith in *man* expresses the vision of the human-ness, the humaneness, the humanity of man. It is the vision which speaks in the following prayer:

"May I be no man's enemy, and may I be the friend of that which is eternal and abides. . . . May I never devise evil against any man; if any devise evil against me, may I escape . . . without the need of hurting him. May I love, seek and attain only that which is good. May I wish for all men's happiness and envy none. . . . When I have done or said what is wrong, may I never wait for the rebuke of others, but always rebuke myself until I make amends. . . . May I win no victory that harms either me or my opponent. . . . May I reconcile friends who are wroth with one another. May I, to the extent of my power, give all needful help . . . to all who are in want. May I never fail a friend in danger. . . . May I respect myself. . . . May I always keep tame that which rages within me. . . . May I never discuss who is wicked and what wicked things he has done, but know good men and follow in their footsteps."

No, this is not the prayer of a Catholic priest, a Protestant minister, a Jewish rabbi, a Quaker teacher. These words are those of Eusebius, a "pagan" who lived some two thousand years ago. In these words is the voice of man's best hope on earth.

The Re-interpretation of Dreams

Louis Bisch's *Be Glad You're Neurotic,* first published in 1936, since reprinted twenty-two times, and now available in paper back form on the newsstands, contains some interesting paragraphs on dreams. Those theosophical students who much appreciated Erich Fromm's *The Forgotten Language,* expressive of many intuitions related to esoteric philosophy, will be pleased to know these passages from *Be Glad You're Neurotic,* for Dr. Bish also takes the view that dreams should not be regarded as troublesome interferences with our lives, but rather as likely doors to *self*-discovery. He writes:

If people by and large realized that every dream has a meaning and is more revealing than their own social conversation or facial expression, they would not be so eager to tell their dreams. Instead, they would take the time to think about their sleep thoughts and discover what their unconscious mind is trying to do for them. On the other hand, it is foolish to be disturbed over one's dreams, no matter how many wild animals may appear in them or how frightening they may be. Nor should one be upset if the mood a dream creates carries over into the waking state and is hard to dispel. Just remember that all dreams have a meaning and that this meaning is always a constructive one, aimed to assist you, to make you cognizant of the whole truth, without prejudice, concerning yourself.

A NEW FORM OF EDUCATION

Dr. Bisch continues:

> You may be sure that in the not too distant future no person will be considered educated, as prepared for life, or as capable of facing reality as he should be, if he has not mastered the technique of interpreting his own dreams,
>
> In the past you may have considered your dreams nonsensical and your insomnia, whether occasional or habitual, a nuisance.
>
> From now on try another attitude. Get the most out of either or both. Nature did not create such reactions within yourself for nothing. Discover what nature is trying to do for you; assist it and make yourself glad. . . . And if anybody boasts that he falls dead asleep the second he hits the pillow advise him that this nonneurotic ability of his is not necessarily an asset.

THE FORGOTTEN LANGUAGE

Dr. Fromm's book is focused upon a saying from the *Talmud*: "A dream which is not understood is like a letter which is not opened," and Fromm's introduction, portions of which have already been quoted in THEOSOPHY, includes the following sentences:

> The study of myths and dreams is still in its infancy. It suffers from various limitations. One is a certain dogmatism and rigidity that has resulted from the claims of various psychoanalytic schools, each insisting that it has the only true understanding of symbolic language. Thus we lose sight of the many-sidedness of symbolic language and try to force it into the Procrustean bed of one, and only one, kind of meaning.
>
> Another limitation is that interpretation of dreams is still considered legitimate only when employed by the psychiatrist in the treatment of neurotic patients. On the contrary, I believe that symbolic language is the one foreign language that each of us must learn. Its understanding brings us in touch with one of the most significant sources of wisdom, that of the myth, and it brings us in touch with the deeper layers of our own personalities. In fact, it helps us to understand a level of experience that is specifically human because it is that level which is common to all humanity, in content as well as in style.
>
> Both dreams and myths are important communications from ourselves to ourselves. If we do not understand the language in which they are written, we miss a great deal of what we know and tell ourselves in those hours when we are not busy manipulating the outside world.

PSYCHIATRY AND RELIGION

It has been inevitable that some religionists and psychiatrists would in time contract unnatural alliances, attempting a synthesis between

orthodox theology and a science which should properly be *investigative*—therefore at the opposite pole from that of creedal belief. Yet, as recently remarked in "Word Puzzles," theology and psychology *should* always be at odds as to methods and recommendations.

However, for those whose attitude toward religion is essentially non-sectarian and philosophic, ample opportunity for constructive synthesis remains. Take, for example, an article by William C. Menninger in the spring issue of the *Menninger Quarterly,* wherein Dr. Menninger attempts to establish some "simple rules," from a psychiatric perspective, as an aid to making human relationships more "consistent, constructive and helpful." In the passages that follow one can easily see a reflection of the truly non-sectarian precepts of Buddha and Christ—eternal verities—transcending all specific theologies. Apparently, long experience with twisted and distorted emotional natures again brings these verities into clearer focus and thus reproduces pure theosophical admonitions. The following are from Dr. Menninger's "guiding principles":

"Give More Than You Receive"

1. *Give more than you receive—and enjoy doing it.* All of us started out in life on the receiving end. If we become mature, our greatest satisfaction must come in giving—of ourselves, our substance, our time and energy, our ideas. If the family or society is going to improve, it is because people give.

2. *Try to understand the other fellow.* If you occasionally feel abused, don't just get mad or hurt or call names. Recognize the fact that every individual is different from everyone else. So listen and learn. No one who ever wants to understand people can learn too much about them. This goes for mothers and fathers, for doctors, clergymen and lawyers, and especially good friends.

3. *Give recognition to others.* A word of praise, of thanks or recognition is among the most effective tools in getting along with others.

4. *Be flexible.* It is a sign of both youth and maturity to be able to change our habits and attitudes. If we take an honest look at ourselves, we can see many changes that we should make that would help us to get along better with those about us. This is best illustrated in the family, where parents simply must grow with their children if they are to be helpful and effective.

"These four rules," adds Dr. Menninger, "won't work miracles. They won't change your life overnight. But keep them in mind. Think of them in connection with your daily activities."

A Chaplain's Appreciation

Robert A. Preston, protestant chaplain at the Veteran's Administration Hospital in Topeka, contributes his praise for the attitude of humanitarian psychiatry—thus avoiding the tendency of orthodox Christians to resent an approach to human problems which does not depend upon God and the church. Again, like a genuine Theosophist, Mr. Preston looks to the *best* in psychiatry and refrains from any factional argumentation:

> In looking at psychiatry, a chaplain can scarcely avoid analyzing the philosophical assumptions of psychiatrists, trying to discern what they implicitly believe as revealed by their daily work.
>
> You psychiatrists believe that some people can be understood, and by understanding be helped. Behind this belief there is a belief that many people need help. The facts justify these beliefs. Furthermore, you believe that in re-examining your efforts constantly in the light of the results obtained you can discover and affirm a principle of workability. You have concluded that long term results are more important than immediate results. This brings you into the field of social relationships which I shall mention further in a moment.

Psychiatry and Democracy

Mr. Preston continues:

> You have a belief in the importance and the dignity of the individual human being. It is an assumption, of course, which you make with a dedicated faith, that every individual is worth helping. You believe that each individual has capacities for being destructive, and creative. You feel that it is possible for other human beings like yourselves, granted an understanding of the particular problems or mechanisms of this individual, to guide him in the direction of constructiveness and away from destructiveness. You have demonstrated that it is possible to strengthen the beneficial positive factors in a severe conflict and to restore people to an inner equilibrium. This requires a disciplined honesty in seeking the real sources of trouble, and implies that health demands truthfulness within the self.

These selections again make it apparent that thoughtful humanitarians of differing schools of thought may find their way to recognition of common membership in a fraternity devoted to the welfare of humanity. Such indications as these contribute nicely to establish the validity of H.P.B.'s generalization that "A few centuries more, and there will linger no sectarian beliefs in either of the great religions of humanity. Brahmanism, and Judaism, Christianity and Mahometanism will all disappear before the mighty rush of facts."

ULT LIBRARY
BANGALORE.
Accn. No. 1629